CASE NO.: 07cv207	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA This DEPUTY BY CT JUDGE / U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE: 8/12/08 7-BTM-RBB DOCUMENT FILED BY: Craig Smith; Plaintiff V Link et al CD: Relief from Judgment or Order
Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:	
✓ Local Rule	Discrepancy
5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.
7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
7.1	Missing table of contents
1 5.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
	Supplemental documents require court order
	Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
X	OTHER: No proof of service. Not sure if this is meant to be a motion, so not sure if hearing date and time needed, or separate points and authorities document needed.
	Date forwarded: 8/12/08
ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE F IS HEREBY ORDERED:	
The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.	
~	•
The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.	
Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers	
Counsel is advised	that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant

Document 10

Filed 08/15/2008

K:\COMMON\FORMS\CIVCRM35.WPD
Form # Civ/Crim 35 (4/98) -- [Document Discrepancy / Court Order]

to Local Rule 83.1

Case 3:07-cv-02077-BTM-RBB